

Chapter 6: Background to The Eugenics Movement and Influences on Friedrich Hayek

Ruth Clifford Engs

Professor Emerita

School of Public Health, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

engs@indiana.edu

Engs, Ruth Clifford “Chapter 6: Background to the Eugenics Movement and Influences on Friedrich Hayek” in Robert Leeson, editor. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography Part X: Eugenics, Cultural Evolution, and the Fatal Conceit*. Palgrave-Macmillan. Cham, Switzerland, 2017. This final draft found at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2022/26362>

NOTE: Paper manuscripts and material for Dr. Engs can be found in the IUArchives. Finding aid for collection is available at: http://webapp1.dlib.indiana.edu/findingaids/view?doc.view=entire_text&docId=InU-Ar-VAC0859

Introduction

The first part of this chapter describes eugenics, the eugenics movement and its leaders in the United States, Great Britain, and Germany through the late 1930s when Friedrich Hayek was formulating his theories. The second part focuses on Hayek and how the topic through his culture, family, friends, and colleagues may have influenced him. The research questions for this chapter are: did Hayek support eugenics, and in particular Nordic superiority and anti-Semitic negative eugenics; and did his eugenicist colleagues influence him in the development of his theories?

Although several definitions and concepts exist concerning eugenics, it can briefly be summed up by Stanford President David Starr Jordan (1911, np.) as “the science and the art of being well born.” The eugenics movement was a public health and social reform campaign to aid in this effort so as to improve the health and vitality of the nations, primarily in western cultures, during the early part of the twentieth century.¹

The author, Ruth Clifford Engs (2014,313), suggests that “eugenics, in the United States, was an aspect of the Clean Living Movement² of the Progressive Era (1890-1920) and was entwined with various public health campaigns to ‘clean up America’ including Prohibition and the eradication of tuberculosis.” Mark Haller (1963, 5) notes that “eugenics at first was closely related to the other reform movements of the progressive era and drew its early support from many of the same persons. It began as a scientific reform in an age of reform.”³

Progressive era physicians and social welfare professionals observed that the “degenerate unfit” (paupers, alcoholics, the feeble-minded, criminals and insane)⁴ were outbreeding the healthy, industrious and “fit.” These professionals were convinced that controlling reproduction among the “unfit,” and encouraging the healthy and “fit” to produce more children, would reduce disease and welfare costs. In addition nativist – Anglo-Nordic superiority – activists supported restricting “degenerate” eastern and southern European “races”⁵ from immigrating to Anglo-Germanic nations, in order to preserve the middle-class way of life and to prevent the decay of western civilization. Eugenics was the solution to these problems, and professionals considered it a humanitarian effort (Engs 2005, xv, 43, 162-163).

The American academic Louis Menand, in *The Metaphysical Club* (2001, 441), argues that the “good of society” was more important than the “rights of the individual” in the early twentieth-century thinking compared to contemporary times. The concepts of the “rights of society” versus “the rights of the individual” go in and out of fashion even in democracies. In the 1960s the rights of the individual emerged as the prevailing philosophy in the western world. Therefore, when examining the eugenics movement, we need to be careful in judging past social, political, economic, and public health reformers and their beliefs and activities through the lens of the early twenty-first century – with some similar concerns – lest we be judged in the future for some of our current attitudes, beliefs and policies.

Most current interpretations of the eugenics movement have generally focused upon negative eugenics and neglected other aspects the movement that evolved into modern statistics, genetics, psychological testing, anthropology, medical genetics, and other sciences. Positive eugenics programs, such as encouraging women to have adequate diets and abstain from alcohol and tobacco during pregnancy, pre-natal care to increase the probability of having a healthy child, and well-baby clinics to discover health problems for early correction, that are universally part of health care, can be attributed to the eugenics movement but have rarely been discussed in detail. This chapter and possible influences of the eugenics movement on Hayek will again focus on negative eugenics as Hayek’s writings do not appear to reflect positive eugenics programmes.

The Nature of Eugenics ⁶

It had been noticed since antiquity that physical, mental, and moral characteristics ran in families. Therefore, families encouraged, or arranged for, their children to make the “best marriages” with the fittest, healthiest and wealthiest individuals for producing the “best” children. As stated by pivotal American eugenics leader and biologist, Charles Benedict Davenport (1866-1944), in *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics* (1911, 1), “Man is an organism – an animal; and the laws of improvement of corn and of race horses hold true for him also. Unless people accept this simple truth and let it influence marriage selection human progress

will cease.” However, these early geneticists/eugenicists “oversimplified the problem of human genetics” (Haller 1963, 3).

The term for encouraging marriage between those from “good stock” as a method for improving the human race was not coined until 1883. Francis Galton (1822-1911), a British naturalist, in *Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development* (1883, 24-25) derived “eugenics” from the Greek *eugenes*, meaning “good in stock, hereditarily endowed with noble qualities,” after noting that wealth, ability, and intelligence appeared to run in certain families; Galton and his cousin naturalist Charles Darwin (1809-1882) were from this type of illustrious family. Galton (1869, 1) argued that the theory of evolution implies that “it would be quite practical to produce a highly gifted race of men by judicious marriages during several consecutive generations.”

In 1904, Galton (1904, 1) revised his definition of eugenics, as “the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of the [human] race; also with those that develop them to the utmost advantage.” Near the end of his life Galton (1909, 81) suggested that eugenics is “the study of *agencies under social control* that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations either physically or mentally.”[Emphasis mine].

Types of Eugenics

British physician and eugenics crusader Caleb W. Saleeby (1878-1940) coined the terms *positive* and *negative* eugenics (Saleeby 1909, 172).⁷ In 1914 Saleeby (1914, 182) also coined the term *dysgenics* which was the opposite of eugenics; the term *cacogenics* was also used particularly in the United States.

Positive Eugenics

In terms of positive eugenics, Davenport (1911,4) points out that “The general program of the eugenicist is clear – it is to improve the race by inducing young people to make a more reasonable selection of marriage mates; to fall in love intelligently.” Other examples of positive eugenics, which intertwined with most public health crusades of the Progressive era in the United States, included “better babies” and “fitter families” contests at state fairs to ascertain the health of children and families along with well-child exams.⁸

Public policies included immunizations against communicable diseases, Prohibition, clean water and milk, sanitation, pure food and drugs, anti-tuberculosis and social hygiene (anti-sexually transmitted disease) activities (Engs 2003; Engs 2005, 186; Pickens 1968). American economist and eugenics supporter, Irving Fisher (1867-1947), argued that “Health reform

brings in its train great and lasting reduction in poverty, criminality, and vice” (Fisher 1910, 746).

In Britain positive eugenics was the primary eugenics philosophy. It focused on the elimination of “racial poisons” such as “venereal disease,” alcohol, and tuberculosis which were thought to lead to race degeneracy.⁹ Saleeby (1914, 20) realized that environmental factors were also important for improving health. Nutrition supplements for mothers and children along with educational programs, sanitation, public health efforts and post-natal care to reduce infant mortality were other aspects of positive eugenics.

In Germany, healthy lifestyles and marrying the fit and healthy were championed through the 1920s. The first German eugenicists campaigned to increase the biological fitness, health, and “efficiency” of the nation through public health and physical culture and to eliminate inherited degeneracy, alcoholism, venereal disease, and increase the birthrate of the culturally and socially fit. Running concurrently with the German health movement was the racial hygiene or purity of the German race movement (Weiss 1986, 34-35).

Negative Eugenics

According to Davenport (1911, 4),¹⁰ negative eugenics, “includes *the control by the state of the propagation of the mentally incompetent. It does not imply destruction of the unfit either before or after birth.*” [Emphasis mine]. These methods included sterilization, mandatory tests for syphilis before obtaining a marriage license, and social purity (anti-prostitution) laws. It also included segregation in institutions during the reproductive years of the mentally and physical “defectives,” “hereditary criminals” and prostitutes.

Negative eugenics such as sterilization was primarily embraced by the United States, Germany, the Canadian provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, the Scandinavian, central and southeastern European cultures, and Japan. These measures were considered a humanitarian effort for the common good of society.¹¹

The Underpinnings of Eugenics: Lamarck, Mendel, and Darwin

Eugenics developed out of the intertwining of Darwinism and Lamarckian theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics. French naturalist Jean-Baptist Lamarck (1744-1829) claimed that characteristics developed from environmental influences were inherited. Darwin proposed that changes over time in species are the result of natural selection. This theory became an underlying theme of the early eugenics movement Engs (2005, 37).¹²

Lamarckian Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics

Lamarck's inheritance of acquired characteristics proposal was the accepted theory of inheritance, until the second decade of the twentieth-century. It was the foundation of "degeneracy theory" in which acquired negative characteristics such as alcoholism, pauperism, tuberculosis and syphilis were thought to be passed to offspring. It was believed that racial poisons could damage the "germ cells"—ovum and sperm—and this damage could be inherited leading to *race degeneracy*.¹³

Mendelian Inheritance

Augustinian Monk Gregor Mendel (1822-1884) in 1866 discovered the basic laws of genetics and heredity. But these principles were not rediscovered until 1900 and did not become widely accepted until over a decade later when professionals began to ascribe both positive and negative human traits, such as intelligence or criminality, to Mendelian inheritance exclusively, rather than environmental factors (Davenport 1911, 10-21; Chapter III). The importance of heredity was advocated by popular science writer and eugenics advocate, Albert Wiggam (1871-1957), in *The Fruit of the Family Tree* (1924, 170). He argues that "The sound personal health of the parents, combined with the sound germ plasm which they may carry, is from four to five times as important in the future health of the children, as pure milk, good doctors, open air, physical culture, and hygiene all put together." Lamarckian inheritance, however, still remained an undercurrent in some public health and social campaigns to eliminate racial poisons.¹⁴

Darwin and Social Darwinism

Darwin's theory of natural selection led to "Social Darwinism." Social Darwinism posits that individuals, groups, and societies are subject to the same laws of natural selection as found among plants and animals. This process resulted in the "survival of the fittest," a phrase coined by British intellectual and sociologist Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) (Spencer 1864, 444). Social Darwinists believed that the process of natural selection, acting on a human population, would lead to continued improvement of the human race and survival of the best social, economic, and political systems. As a justification for class structure, Social Darwinism in Britain suggested that successful social-economic classes were composed of those most biologically superior. This ideology was also embraced by German eugenicists.¹⁵

The Eugenics Movement

The Dawn of the Early Twentieth Century Movement

The Eugenics movement in the United States, Germany and Britain arose almost simultaneously around the turn of the twentieth century. In the United States the focus was on the “feeble-minded” and mentally ill, the superiority of northern Europeans, and blocking immigrants from “undesirable parts” of the world (Engs 2014). Britain was concerned about pauperism (inherited poverty) and the genetic difference between the middle class and lower class. Alcoholism and diseases were regarded as a part of this genetically based pauperism. German eugenics strived for breeding of fit Caucasians linked with a medical concern about the inferiority of those with mental illness and disability, and epilepsy (Searle 1976; Kühl 2013, 14; Weiss 1987a, 10-13).

The eugenics movement was led by prominent academics, and health and social welfare professionals who had deep concerns about the deterioration of their nations. “Unlike other health movements of this era, such as prohibition and tuberculosis, the eugenics movement never became a crusade of the masses. Eugenics largely remained a matter of concern with the upper middle class, supported by leaders in biology, psychology, criminology, social work, sociology, liberal religion, and medicine” (Engs, 2003, 115). Jonathan Marks (1993, 651) notes that “*to be against eugenics in the 1920s was to be ...against modernity, progress, and science*” [emphasis mine].

Intelligence or “IQ”

The question of inherited general intelligence was intertwined with the eugenics movement. Galton, as previously noted, believed that intelligence was inherited and ran in families and reasoned that social class reflected differences in “innate endowment.” Intelligence tests of World War I recruits in the United States showed eastern and southern European immigrants to have lower IQ scores, compared to northern Europeans. Results of these studies alleged that immigrants from these countries were harmful to the strength and vitality of the American people as it was believed to be largely inherited.¹⁶ Davenport (1929, 89) based on his studies concluded, “there are differences in the sensory and intellectual fields between different races of mankind.”

Intelligence or “IQ” (Intelligence Quotient) was coined in 1912 by German psychologist W. L. Stern (1871-1938). It became a major factor in eugenic sterilization programmes and was an important justification for both positive and negative eugenic agendas. It supported eugenic sterilization of the “feeble-minded” and immigration restriction laws in the United States. However, over the course of the twentieth and into the twenty-first century, the nature of intelligence, whether it can be measured, whether it is inherited, caused by environmental factors, or a combination of these, has been, and is, contentiously debated.¹⁷

Hierarchy of the Races and the Evolution of Nativism/Nordicism thought

Besides fear of degenerates outbreeding the middle class, some professionals were also concerned by a decline in the birth rate among the “superior” Anglo-Saxon/Nordic racial stock, and the increase in the birth rate of “inferior racial stocks,” such as eastern European Jews and southern European Roman Catholics (Haller 1963, 78-82). Kühl (2013, 101) notes that the Vienna population scientist Wilhelm Winkler confirmed that “in Austria, the ‘one-child marriage’ had become the most common type of marriage, and in Vienna, it was even the ‘no-child marriage.’” This fecundity of “degenerates” leading to the decline in western civilization was termed *race suicide* in the early twentieth century. The term was coined by sociologist Edward A. Ross (1866-1951) in 1901, and American President Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919) popularized it. The differential birth rate became a theme of the nativist and Nordicism branch of the eugenics movement in the United States, Britain, and Germany.

Hierarchy of Races and Northern European Superiority

Superiority of northern Europeans has its etiology in French Count Arthur de Gobineau’s (1816-1882), *Essai sur l’inégalité des races humaines* (1853–1855) – *Moral and Intellectual Diversity of Races* (1856).¹⁸ He divided the human population into three races and proclaimed that Europeans, and in particular northern Europeans, “Aryans” or Nordics, were at the top of the ladder in terms of intelligence, health and being civilized. This group was followed by Asians, and on the bottom Africans who de Gobineau considered unintelligent, unhealthy and uncivilized. He claimed interbreeding of these races had led to the “downfall of civilizations” in the past. Gobineau (1856, 149-151) further argued that “A nation is degenerate, when the blood of its founders no longer flows in its veins, but has been gradually deteriorated by successive foreign mixtures; so that the nation, while retaining its original name, is no longer composed of the same elements [or race].

At the beginning of the twentieth century, fear of higher birth rates among the so called “inferior races” – non-northern Europeans – led to the great majority of educated white Europeans and North Americans, along with race hygienists, to accept “the racial and cultural superiority of the Caucasians as a matter of course” (Weiss 1987b, 194). German anthropologist Hans Günther (1891–1968) (1926, 261) notes that the “Nordic ideal is primarily among the middle class.” Furthermore, *the hierarchy of the races was considered an accepted scientific belief*. Sociologist Elazar Barkan (1992, 2-3) notes that “the inferiority of certain races was no more to be contested than the law of gravity to be regarded as immoral.” By today’s standards these beliefs would be considered racist.¹⁹

Anti-Semitism and Jewish Eugenicists

Anti-Semitism was rife within the nativist/Nordic superiority aspect of the eugenics movement. This was found primarily in Austria/Germany, but also in Britain and the United States. Intolerance between Jews and other religious groups in biblical times, along with Christians blaming Jews for Christ's death, have led to the sporadic persecution of Jewish people over the past 2000 years. Being Jewish is based on religious, cultural and social elements (Huxley and Hadden 1936, 15). Modern anti-Semitism originated in de Gobineau's hierarchy of races, along with rising "Nordic supremacy" ideology in Europe in the late 1800s. By this time Jews were becoming successful in business, science, medicine, politics, and other areas. Because of their success and because they often did not mix socially with non-Jews, they were frequently seen by envious Gentiles as being power and money hungry, manipulative, and conspiring to control world finances, the press, academia, and the arts. This attitude was found in the United States, Britain, Russia, and in particular Germany, and became known as "the Jewish question." (Crowe 2008; Engs 2005, 124; Glad 2011, 6).

Jews, however, were active in the early twentieth-century eugenics movement on both sides of the Atlantic. In Germany Jews belonged to the German Society for Race Hygiene until the Nazis took power in 1933. In the United States, liberal Jews supported birth control, eugenics, social hygiene, and other health-reform efforts of the Progressive era. John Glad (2011, 9) argues that "given the massive assault on the eugenics movement as a supposedly 'anti-Semitic' ideology of genocide... historical veracity requires that the distorted image produced over the last four decades be rectified." Glad documents the many Jews including physicians, Reform rabbis, and other professionals took leadership roles and supported the movement in the United States and abroad.

The Eugenics Movement in the United States

The American eugenics movement evolved out of the formation of the American Breeders Association (ABA) in 1906. Genetics and eugenics was the same field until they separated into two disciplines in 1910. The ABA published *The American Breeders Magazine: A Journal Genetics and Eugenics* (1906-1914). It became *The Journal of Heredity* in 1914. In 1914 the ABA became the American Genetic Association. The historiography of the eugenics movement suggests it can be divided into three major phases.²⁰ David Haller ([1963]1984, 6-7) points out that before 1905 social welfare professionals were concerned about restricting propagation among the unfit and undesirable based on Lamarckian hereditarian concerns. From 1905-1930 the organized movement was at its peak, and a nativist element was influential. Eugenic sterilization, permanent custodial care and immigrant restrictions laws were passed. Positive eugenics such as "fitter family" events were held. The movement declined after 1930. Pickens (1968, 5) suggested "the Great Depression of 1929 and the rise of genetics marked the decline of eugenics as an organized movement."

The Eugenics Record Office (ERO), with its director Charles Davenport, was the most influential eugenics organization in the nation. The ERO, at the biological research station in Cold Spring Harbor, NY, was established in 1910 as “a repository and clearing house for eugenic records of families.” This office helped facilitate and coordinate all aspects of the movement in the United States. Davenport’s superintendent, or assistant director, Harry Laughlin (1880-1943), was a central figure in the nativist faction of the movement. He championed immigration restriction and sterilization laws. The organization published *Eugenical News* (1916-1953) – now called *Social Biology* – to report activities of the ERO. Based upon British statistician and eugenicist Karl Pearson (1857-1936), Davenport introduced statistics into biology and collected data for “family history” or “pedigree studies.”

These studies became the basis for his *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics* (1911) a widely quoted work that accelerated the early eugenics movement in the United States.²¹ The subjects of the pedigree studies were poor white native-born families – generally Anglo-American – who were thought to have “degenerate” characteristics. “Although family pedigree studies were considered scientific for their day, by the mid-twentieth century they were deemed faulty inasmuch as observations of traits were often subjective and many human characteristics could not be explained by simple Mendelian inheritance” (Engs 2005, 69). Moreover, Thomas Leonard (2003, 691) suggests that family history studies of Anglo-Saxon clans “gives weight to environmental as well as hereditary causes of degeneracy.”

Several organizations and international conferences were organized to promote eugenics. In 1912, Leonard Darwin (1850-1943), son of Charles Darwin, organized the First International Congress of Eugenics in London with international attendance. Many American eugenics leaders helped plan the conference or were in attendance.²² The Second International Conference on Eugenics was held in New York (1921). Out of this conference the American Eugenics Society (AES) was founded in 1926. The AES was renamed the Society for the Study of Social Biology in 1972.²³ Its purpose was to promote eugenics on the popular level and to improve the human race through education and legislation. It also published the journal *Eugenics* (1928-1931).

Physician John H. Kellogg (1852-1943) founded the Race Betterment Foundation in Battle Creek, Michigan at his sanitarium (1906-1955). The organization sponsored three conferences between 1914 and 1928. In 1928 it established a Eugenics Registry for family biological records. The Galton Society (1918-1939) was an elitist and nativist group to study racial anthropology. It had links with the Eugenics Education Society in London. “In the late 1920s it began to avidly support Nazi German views through its official journal *Eugenical News*. These sentiments raised concern among some geneticists and eugenicist, causing many of them to dissociate themselves from the organization in the mid-1930s (Engs 2005, 85; Haller 1984).

A number of books on eugenics arose in the decade prior to and after the World War I by prominent academics and others which helped foster the eugenics movement among the educated public. In the pre-war period, Stanford University President, David Star Jordan (1851-1931), wrote the anti-war and pro-eugenic booklet *Blood of the Nation* (1902, 12). In this work he proposes that “a race of men or a herd of cattle are governed by the same laws of selection” and suggests that when the fit, brave, and strong are sent to battle to die, the weak and “unfit” remain home and reproduce. It is the descendants of these individuals who, in turn, make up the future character of the nation. Physician Michael Guyer penned *Being Well-born: An Introduction to Eugenics* (1916) which focused on positive eugenics.

In the post-World War I period, Paul Popenoe (1888-1979), editor of the genetic/eugenic research periodical *The Journal of Heredity*, and Roswell Johnson (1877–1967), a biology and geology professor at the University of Pittsburgh, in *Applied Eugenics*, discussed “practical means by which society may encourage the reproduction of the superior and discourage that of inferiors” (Popenoe and Johnson, 1922, v). William J. Robinson, MD (1867-1936) in *Eugenics, Marriage and Birth Control* (1922, 111-112) proclaimed that “society cannot prevent the birth of all the unfit and degenerates, but it certainly has the right to prevent the birth of as many as it can.”

Negative eugenics reached its peak activity and influence in the mid-1920s. Sterilization of the “unfit” had been instituted in many states. Indiana was the first state to enact sterilization legislation in 1907; two years later Washington and California followed. Harry Laughlin’s *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States* (1922) chronicled the history of the legal sterilization movement in the United States along with a Model Law. In 1927 Supreme Court case *Buck v. Bell* legitimized the forced sterilization of a patient in a Virginia home for the mentally retarded. This set precedence for other states.²⁴ E.S. Gosney and Paul Popenoe’s (1929), *Sterilization for Human Betterment; A Summary of Results of 6,000 Operations in California, 1909-1929*, lauded sterilizations in California which had the highest rate compared to any state. Leon Whitney (1894-1973) executive secretary of the American Eugenics Society, during its most active years (1924-1934), wrote *The Case for Sterilization* (1934). He notes that “Sterilization ... has immediate and vital bearing on human life: on our personal happiness, on the welfare of our families, on the individual and community pocket-book, on the quality of our race in the long run” (Whitney, 1934, 9). He also lauded Nazi Germany’s eugenics sterilization program in several publications and was removed from his position due to some scientific members of the society being embarrassed by these work. These publications influenced the state mandate sterilizations in Germany under National Socialism.²⁵

The Nativist Aspect of the Eugenics Movement in the United States

As discussed, it was believed that the mixing of different races lead to the decay of civilization. Therefore, many feared that "racially inferior" immigrants intermarrying with "racially fit" "old-stock" Americans would lead to race degeneracy. This fear was an underpinning of nativism—a "pro-American conviction" that the United States should be preserved primarily for white Anglo-Saxon Protestants.²⁶

Sub-groups of European "races" were classified from desirable to undesirable by nativist, eugenicist, immigration restriction, and conservation promoter Madison Grant (1865-1937). He defines Northern-European "Nordics" or "Aryans" on the top, Eastern-European "Alpines" in the middle, and southern European "Mediterraneans" on the bottom in terms of racial worth.²⁷ Grant (1916, 228) in *Passing of the Great Race* feared that "if the Melting Pot is allowed to boil without control, and we continue to follow our national motto and deliberately blind ourselves to all 'distinctions of race, creed, or color,' the type of native American of Colonial descent will become ...extinct."

This nativist aspect of the eugenics movement in the United States led to immigration restriction laws to prevent "degenerative" Asians and eastern-and southern-European Jewish and Roman Catholic immigrants from entering the United States and "degrading" the health, heredity, intelligence and traditional values of the Anglo-American culture. Eminent anthropologist and director of the American Museum of Natural History, in New York City, Henry F. Osborn (1857-1935) at the height of the movement sums this up when he states "for America eugenics rests both on birth selection and upon immigrant selection"(1924, 51).

Anti-Semitism and Anti-Popery

In the United States the Jewish population greatly expanded during the Progressive era (1890-1920). In 1880 Jews numbered about a quarter of a million in the nation. Most were of Germanic ancestry, were well-established and relatively prosperous. The majority practiced Reform Judaism, the more liberal branch of the religion, and had more or less assimilated into American culture. Between 1880 and 1914 approximately 2.5 million impoverished Russian, Polish, and other eastern European Jews migrated to the United States. They tended to be of the Orthodox, or more conservative branch, of the religion. The majority of these immigrants flooded into the already overcrowded tenements of New York City. They did not readily assimilate and kept to themselves. In 1892 Jewish immigrants were blamed for bringing typhus and a cholera epidemic to New York City. Some of these immigrants were radical Bolsheviks (Communists). Fear of disease and possible Communist takeover of traditional American Protestant values helped spawn a nativist and immigration restriction movements.²⁸

In the late 1880s, numerous uneducated poor Catholics from southern and eastern-Europe also crowded into eastern cities. This led to fear of a Papal takeover of the nation. A flood of Chinese laborers, who did not readily assimilate, swarmed into the west coast. These tides of immigrants led to anti-immigration laws. The first law was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1892. A public health law, the National Quarantine Act of 1893, attempted to prevent impoverished and often sick and diseased southern and eastern-European immigrants from entering the country. In 1894 the Immigration Restriction League was founded to advocate for stricter regulations of "undesirable" immigrants.²⁹

The anti-immigration nativist crusade became interwoven with eugenics and reached its zenith immediately before and after World War I. Madison Grant and political analyst Lothard Stoddard (1883-1950) were two of the major leaders of the nativist eugenic faction. Their publications helped foster racial fears, fanned immigrant restriction and influenced the passage of the 1924 immigration act. Grant's popular publication, *The Passing of the Great Race* (1916), claims that the Nordic race was racially superior to other groups through its achievements in science, religion, economics and governments throughout western history. Stoddard's *The Rising Tide of Color against White World-Supremacy* (1920) and *Revolt against Civilization: The Menace of the Under Man* (1922) suggests that the white race was disappearing and would be mongrelized. Noted Yale economics professor, eugenics and nativism supporter Irving Fisher (1867-1947) argued that "the core of the problem of immigration is one of race and eugenics" (1921, 226).

Based upon investigations of the federal Dillingham Commission in 1907 – with Laughlin providing evidence – sweeping legislation was passed in 1910 that excluded the "feeble minded," insane, and those with physical and moral defects. However, eugenicists, along with the Immigration Restriction League, campaigned for more comprehensive laws. In 1920, the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization published *Biological Aspects of Immigration* which again largely consisted of Harry Laughlin's, "expert testimony" to the committee. This led to a temporary *National Origins Act in 1921*. Nativism linked with eugenics peaked with the *Johnson-Reed Immigration Act of 1924*. The bill mandated a quota of foreign born to 2% of the ethnic groups who resided in the country in 1890, which were mostly northern Europeans, and guaranteed that the proportion of new immigrants from southern and eastern-Europe would be small. This national origins exclusion mandate was not revised until the 1965 Hart-Celler Act.³⁰

The Eugenics Movement in Britain

The most influential years of the British movement were between 1901 and 1914. During this period numerous books, pamphlets, and articles were published by British writers to educate the middle class about eugenic concepts. The movement in Britain is divided into two phases,

the pre-World War I (1901-1914) and the post-war eras (1920-1935). Similar to other western cultures, the early twentieth-century British eugenics movement was fostered by the educated middle-class, and considered a vital social program to prevent race degeneracy and the decay of western civilization. Unlike the United States, Germany, and other nations, few eugenics laws were passed and eugenics did not become institutionalized. The only major eugenics legislation passed was the Deficiency Act of 1913, which allowed for the segregation of mentally disabled and ill individuals in state run institutions. The British movement focused on positive eugenics and encouraged the fit to reproduce.³¹

In Britain, by 1901, two schools of thought concerning heredity and evolutionary change had evolved which greatly influenced the British eugenics movement. The proponents of one school, led by British biologist William Bateson (1861-1926), embraced the theory of Mendelian inheritance and viewed statistics as unimportant. This group established the Eugenics Education Society (1907) with the goal of promoting eugenics and lobbying for the implementation of eugenics laws. The society founded *Eugenics Review* in 1909 to publish articles promoting its cause. Leonard Darwin (1916a, 173) was the driving force of the group. He proclaimed, “The aim of the eugenicist is to increase the rate of multiplication of the more fit, and to decrease that of the less fit.” Prominent British peerage, social reformers, clergy, academics and scientist belong to the society.³² The Eugenics Education Society, was renamed the Eugenics Society (ES) in 1926, and the Galton Institute in 1989. It published *Eugenics Review* (1909-1968).

Leaders of this intellectual tradition and prominent members of the ES included two directors of the London School of Economics (LSE). These were William Beveridge (1879-1963), and Alexander Carr-Saunders (1886-1966) – formerly at Oxford – and a close friend of Friedrich Hayek. Other prominent eugenics leaders included Oxford’s evolutionary biologist Julian S. Huxley (1887-1975) and Cambridge economist John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946).³³ Popular eugenics writer, physician and health crusader, Caleb Saleeby (1878-1940), wrote for *Eugenics Review* and popularized eugenics through his numerous writings before and after World War I that were available on both sides of the Atlantic. Cambridge political economist Arthur C. Pigou (1877-1959) – although not a member – gave the prestigious 1923 Galton lecture for the ES.³⁴ As leaders of the eugenics movement and/or members of the society, they wrote articles for *Eugenics Review*, books on eugenics and population in the pre-and post-World War I era.

Carr-Saunders was intensely involved in the eugenics movement. He published articles and a popular, rather than an academic volume, *Eugenics* (1926). In the acknowledgement he thanks eugenicists and statistician Ronald A. Fisher (1890-1962) and Julian Huxley (1887-1975) who read the proofs. Carr-Saunders was also a delegate at the Berlin World Population Congress in 1935 (Kühl 2013, 99-101).

A review of annual lists of officers, fellows and members of the Eugenics Society in *Eugenics Review* from 1930 until 1950 did not find Hayek listed as either a fellow or member of this society nor did he give any lectures or write articles for *Eugenics Review* at any point. In addition, he was not involved with any Germanic racial hygiene organizations or conferences.³⁵

In 1905 Galton established the eugenics laboratory at University College London with statistician Karl Pearson (1857-1936) as the first Galton Professor. This laboratory was the center for the second school of thought concerning evolution, heredity and eugenics. It proposed that biometry (application of statistics to biological phenomena) and Darwinian natural selection could explain the laws of heredity. University College London statistician R. A. Fisher – a vice president of the Eugenics Society (1930-1937) – was a link between the two intellectual traditions. Although he was an active member in the ES, Fisher was closely associated with Pearson and the laboratory. The lab published *Annals of Eugenics* (1925-1954) with numerous research reports. In 1926 the journal was renamed *Annals of Human Genetics*. Fisher frequently published articles in this journal.

The two organizations, each supporting one of these philosophies, became the leading institutions of the British eugenics movement. The differences in opinion concerning the mechanism of inheritance resulted in a bitter dispute between the two groups. In 1930 R. A. Fisher, using statistics to combine Mendelian genetics and natural selection, demonstrated that Mendel's work provided a foundation for Darwinism and natural selection. Thus the two intellectual traditions were united. This "Darwinian synthesis" of evolution or the "modern evolutionary synthesis" refuted Lamarckian inheritance, regarding acquired characteristics.

Some British intellectuals began to satirize eugenics. These included G. K. Chesterton (1874-1936) who wrote *Eugenics and Other Evils* (1922) and Aldus Huxley (1894-1963), brother of Julian, who penned the classic *Brave New World* (1931). By the mid-1930s, a few eugenicists, including R. A. Fisher, ceased to publically advocate eugenic programs. Several reports of the genetics of "feeble-mindedness" suggested that these problems were caused both by heredity and environment (nature-nurture) and not heredity alone.

Britain and Nordicism

The British were focused on eliminating racial poisons and encouraging the fit to marry. They were less likely to support racist ideologies. Some British eugenicists, including Pearson, did express anti-Semitic rhetoric. Pearson remarks in a "research paper" that Jews are a "parasitic race" (Pearson and Moul 1925, 8). In Britain negative eugenics laws, such as sterilization, were not passed because most British considered this an abridgement of civil

rights. Some socialist eugenicists including Cambridge evolutionary biologist J. B. S. Haldane (1892-1964), condemned Nordicism and wanted eugenics to be free of class structure (Kühl 2013, 116).

The Racial Hygiene Movement in Germany

Empire and Republic

The German eugenics movement can be divided into the Empire (1890-1918), Republic (1918-1933), and Nazi German (1933-1946) eras. “The theme of improving the biological efficiency of the nation was the major thread found throughout the German eugenics movement” (Engs 2005, 113).³⁶ German eugenics was also called race hygiene (*Rassenhygiene*).³⁷ In the German language, Race Hygiene had two meanings: “Hereditary fitness” and a “large group of people” who by their common descent possessed common hereditary traits which separated them from other groups, or races (Weiss 1987a, 102). Out of this meaning, two branches of eugenics arose in Germany – non-racialist eugenicists who strove for improvement of the health and efficiency of the nation, and Nordic superiority eugenicists who strove for health and efficiency of the Nordic or Aryan race.

Wilhelm Schallmayer (1857-1917) established the theoretical base for eugenics in Germany. He helped launch the German eugenics movement in 1903 with *Vererbung und Auslese im Lebenslauf der Völker* (*Heredity and Selection in the Life History of Nations*) which became the classic work through the 1920s (Weiss 1987a, 3-4). This work went through two revised editions - 1910 and 1918 (Weiss 1986, 34). Schallmayer considered social class differences important and promoted reproduction (positive eugenics) among the socially productive middle class and was “dedicated to improving the hereditary fitness of all populations, be they composed primarily of one anthropological race or many...[as all] were equally susceptible to degeneration and equally open to biological improvement” (Weiss, 1987a, 102).

In 1895 physician, biologist and Nordic superiority advocate, Alfred Ploetz (1860-1940), the pivotal leader of the eugenics moment in the pre-World War I year's, coined the term *Rassenhygiene*. In his early years he did not express anti-Semitic feelings (Weiss 1987b, 201-203).

Ploetz along with psychiatrist Ernst Rüdin (1874-1952) and others in 1904 founded the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* (*Archive for Racial and Social Biology*), the first academic journal devoted to eugenics, and the following year the world's first eugenics organization, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene* [the German Society for Race Hygiene (1905-ca.1945)]. It became the major voice for the German eugenics movement. The only criterion for membership was to be Caucasian and ethically, intellectually,

physically, and economically “fit.” Its mission was to increase the health and efficiency of the German people, to educate the middle class concerning eugenic ideals and act as a model for positive eugenics (Weiss 1987b, 206-208).³⁸

Schallmayer, around 1907, after becoming familiar with Galton’s work on eugenics, used the Germanized *Eugenik* in his writings rather than race hygiene on the grounds that he did not like its “Nordic purity” connotations. However, Schallmayer failed to persuade most of his colleagues to abandon *Rassenhygiene* as they liked the double meaning (Weiss 1987a, 103). Schallmayer also criticized count Arthur de Gobineau’s theory of the “hierarchy of the races” as unscientific (Weiss 1987a, 100,119-124).

The society as a whole became defunct by the end of WWI, but was revived in 1922, and an emphasis was placed on public health and welfare. In 1927 the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics was founded and became the single most important institution for race hygiene in Germany (Weingart, 1989, 260).

In the Weimar Republic of the 1920s, increased conflict arose between the social welfare-oriented Berlin chapter of the Racial Hygiene Society and the racist Munich chapter, now led by Lenz, which leaned toward Nordic supremacist ideology (Weiss 1987b, 218). Austrian bacteriologist Max von Gruber (1853-1927), Ploetz, and Rüdin were sympathetic to this point of view. Respected eugenic leaders including Hermann Muckermann (1877-1962), a former Jesuit active in the Berlin society and head of the Eugenics Department of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute; Arthur Ostermann (1864-1941?), senior health official of the Prussian Ministry of Welfare; and most society members at the Berlin group were opposed to Nordicism. They supported improving the efficiency and health of the entire population and not just the Nordic race. Although by 1930 many eugenicists desired mandatory sterilization for the “unfit,” this position was seen as politically inopportune in the pre-Nazi era (Weiss 1987a, 152).

The Nordic Superiority Branch of the Eugenics Movement

Paralleling the eugenics movement was a Nordic movement that bore similarities to the nativist aspects of the eugenics movement in the United States. In 1899 natural scientist and philosopher H. S. Chamberlain (1855-1927), a British national who became a German citizen, wrote *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* (*Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*) an anti-Semitic and Nordic superiority work. In this popular publication, Chamberlain categorized all Europeans as the “Aryan race,” which sprung from the ancient Proto-Indo-European culture. The leaders of the Aryan race were the Nordic or Teutonic peoples.

Around 1911 some leaders of the Munich branch of the Racial Hygiene Society, including Ploetz and his wife founded a secret “Nordic ring,” within the society, whose aim was the improvement of the Nordic race. One member was Ploetz’s protégée, geneticist and future Nazi eugenics leader, Fritz Lenz (1887-1976). This group continued to be active during the war years and in 1918-1919 transformed into a Nordic improvement group called the *Widar Bund* (Weiss 1987b, 218-219).

Immediately following World War I, several books were published with themes of Nordic racial superiority. De Gobineau’s work was translated into German as *Gobineaus Rassenlehre* (1920). British anthropologist V. Gordon Childe (1892-1957) traced the history of the “Aryan” [Indo Europeans] and “Nordic race” – those who spoke Germanic languages – through the Indo-European language. He implies preeminence of the Germanic languages and Nordics over other ethnic groups as “the Nordics’ superiority in physique fitted them to be the vehicles of a superior language” (Childe 1926, 212).

German anthropologist and later Nazi academic, Hans Günther, helped popularize Nordic superiority ideology. Günther (1926, 254) remarks in *The Racial Elements of European History* (*Rassenkunde Europas*) that de Gobineau “was the first to point out in his work the importance of the Nordic race for the life of the peoples.” He promoted Nordic superiority eugenics to save the Nordic race which he also claimed is found “among the peoples of Germanic speech in Europe and North America” (Günther 1926, 256).

Anti-Semitism

Weindling (2007, 264) notes, “While it is clear that German racial hygienists, notably Alfred Plotz (1850-1949) and Fritz Lenz (1887-1976), were Nordic racial idealists, both were cautious in articulating anti-Semitic sentiments until the patriotic fervor of the First World War brought about an intensification of ideas associated with *lebensraum* and German racial health.”³⁹ Actions against Jews arrived under National Socialism.

Eugenics under National Socialism

Under the Nazi regime the eugenics movement focused on Nordic superiority eugenics and national efficiency (Weiss, 1987b, 227). Moderate eugenicists such as Muckermann and Ostermann were forced into retirement or ousted from their positions in government service – as were Jewish eugenicists. In addition they were also forced out of the eugenics society which now was under the control of the Nazi government. Aristotle Kallis (2007, 389) argues that “there is no more pertinent evidence of the totalitarian nature of the National Socialist regime in Germany than its uncompromising ambition to exercise full authority over every aspect of individual and collective life.”

Beginning in 1933, Hitler charged the medical profession to implement a national program of race hygiene. Several measures were passed to improve national health. From 1934 until the beginning of the war, to prevent undesired births, roughly 360,000 mentally retarded or ill were sterilized against their will (Weiss 1987a, 154-156). Precedence for this was based upon Laughlin's (1922) "model sterilization law." Kühl (2013, 125) notes that there were "many unintended deaths from the operations." Similar to laws in the United States, the Nuremburg 1935 "Law for the protection of the Genetic Health of the German People" required couples to undergo a medical examination prior to marriage, and forbade marriage between people suffering from venereal disease and certain genetic disorders.

Anti-Semitism became rampant. The "Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honor" prohibited marriage and sexual relations between "Aryans" and Jews, as well as the eugenically unfit (Kühl 2013, 112). Marriage loans and child allowances were given to "valuable couples" and stringent antiabortion laws were in place to save "valuable births." Genetic worth certificates were created by a central system of State Health Offices. A flood of pamphlets and books devoted to increasing the birth rate of the fit classes and reducing the number of the non-productive were published (Weiss, 1987a, 156-157). Eugenically fit German SS (*Schutzstaffe*) and Wehrmacht officers, and married and single women who had passed "racial purity exams," were encouraged to produce children. Racially fit teenage girls were encouraged to bear a child for Hitler. Pregnant women in this *lebensborn* program were cared for in privacy.⁴⁰

From the standpoint of "national efficiency," under National Socialism, around 100,000 mentally ill and retarded patients were euthanized between 1939-1941 to save food supplies for the troops. They reasoned that if the fit were being killed in the war, the weak should also sacrifice for the sake of the Reich and the common good. In addition, they had "lives not worthy of living" (Weiss 1987, 157a, Kühl 2013, 125-126). This twisted logic led to slave labor and death camps under the central control of the state.

The End of the Eugenics Movement

Kühl, (2013, 55) argues that in the late 1920s "the consensus among European and north American scientists regarding the superiority of the white race was increasingly falling apart." In the midst of the world-wide depression of the 1930s, the negative eugenics movement ebbed in most countries for several reasons. Genetic research suggested that environment was important in molding human characteristics, such as social achievement, intelligence, and health, and not just heredity. In the United States, which focused upon negative eugenics, many eugenic measures such as eugenic sterilization, immigration restriction, and marriage

licenses had already been legislated resulting to less interest in the crusade. In Britain negative eugenics procedures, such as sterilization, were not passed.

Scientists critical of the use of race to justify oppression and discrimination published a number of important works. American cultural anthropologist Franz Boas (1858-1942) suggested there was little difference between the races and most differences were due to culture and environmental factors. In *We Europeans* (1936), Julian Huxley and anthropologist Alfred C. Haddon (1855-1940), with a commentary by Carr-Saunders, distanced themselves from negative eugenics and racialism. Although in the 1920s these eugenic enthusiasts supported racist and anti-Semitic thought, this work argues against the theory and, in particular, National Socialist race policy. Huxley and Haddon (1936, 236) maintained “racialism is a myth, and a dangerous myth at that...and it is not scientifically grounded.” They argued that we are all of mixed ancestry, there is “no pure race,” and suggested that the term *ethnic groups* should replace race. They now considered studies of race a pseudoscience (Huxley and Haddon 1936, 214, 220-221). Moreover, they exclaimed that “There is not and cannot be such a thing as an Aryan race, since the term Aryan refers to language” (Huxley and Haddon 1936, 222).

After World War II, the twisted concept of eugenics became associated with the Holocaust and the term eugenics became an opprobrium. Even scholars would not touch the subject until the 1960s. “Eugenic ideals, supporters, and organizations, particularly in the United States, were discredited, rejected, and ultimately demonized” (Engs 2005, xv).⁴¹ Eugenicists and eugenic organizations tried to separate themselves from the legacy of the Holocaust and the ideology of Nordic superiority. They eliminated references to “ethnic racism from the official agenda of eugenics societies” (Kühl 1994, 105). Journals that had their origins in the eugenics movement distanced themselves from the philosophy. For example, *Eugenics Quarterly* became *Social Biology* in 1969, *Annals of Eugenics* was renamed *Annals of Human Genetics* in 1954. Kühl (1994, 105) notes that “attempts to separate eugenics from the Nazi program of race improvements were only partially successful. Eugenics became population science, human genetics, anthropology, sociology.

By the turn of the twenty-first century, many interpretations of eugenics and the early twentieth century movement had been offered. A few suggested it was primarily a racist campaign based upon a “pseudo-sciences,” while others argued it was a humanitarian effort and part of the public health, hygiene, physical fitness, and social welfare reform crusades of the era. The world-wide movement varied and embraced all these points of views depending upon the country.

However, numerous authors suggest that eugenics is still found, but it is the individual, not the state, who are selecting eugenic measures; it is consumer driven. Eugenics is now termed

genetic engineering, *in vitro* fertilization, designer babies, and family balancing and implied under the guise of genomic research. The eugenics movement permeated middle class and professional society in the early twentieth century so undoubtedly Friedrich Hayek encountered it in its many forms.

Influences on Friedrich Hayek

Family Background and Early Career

Family and Education

Friedrich or Fredrick (1899-1992) Hayek was born in Vienna the eldest son of an ennobled family. The von Hayek family was ‘proud of their gentility and ancestry’ (Ebenstein 2001,11; Hayek 1994a, 39). Both sides of his family were prominent in Viennese society. As such, they most probably embraced anti-Semitism and Nordic superiority as a matter of course. His background in German and Viennese intellectual thought was different from the philosophical and literary heritage of the Anglo-American world and shaped his thinking. His father was a respected physician, gymnasium (high school) teacher and botanist and both his grandfathers were scholars – one a zoologist. As a young boy Hayek helped his father with botanical classifications, and Darwinian evolution was a dominating feature in Hayek’s early life (Ebenstein 2001, 8; 2003, xii). Ebenstein (2003 xii) remarks that “Hayek ended his career with an evolutionary account of the growth of civilization” influenced by this early interest in Darwinism. Hayek (1994a:42-43) explains that his interests as a youth “gradually shifted from botany to paleontology and the theory of evolution.”⁴²

Among his siblings, one brother (Heinrich or Heinz), became an anatomist and the other (Erik) a chemist (Hayek 1994a, 39). After World War I, the Hapsburg Empire collapsed and the nobility, including his family, lost its titles. Some family members in the 1920s and 1930s supported National Socialism. His younger brother, Erik, was part of the populist *völkisch* movement with “back to nature” and Nordic superiority beliefs (Leeson 2015b, 22-23) and his mother reportedly admired Hitler (Cubitt 2013, 51).⁴³

In the 1930s, Heinrich, the anatomist, used “fixed in fresh condition” material from newly executed and euthanized individuals for his anatomical research. He was also as member of the Nazi party (Hildebrandt 2013, 288-289). However, being a party member may have been necessary to keep his academic position. It is not known if Heinrich knew the circumstances of the fresh corpses used for his and other’s research or if anatomist might have even “ordered” certain types of corpses for specific research projects (Hildebrandt 2013, 288-293; Cubitt 2013,51).

After Hayek had served in World War I, he attended the University of Vienna, earned a law degree in 1921, and took economic courses. In 1923 Hayek received a doctorate in political science (Hayek 1994a, 62-63). Faculty in the Austrian School of Economics exerted a substantial influence on him. Hayek was introduced to the respected economist Ludwig von Mises (1881-1973) who had written an anti-socialist work. Although Hayek considered himself a Fabian socialist, and initially did not like von Mises, under von Mises influence he turned against socialism. Hayek's early academic work was on the influences of money and capital on economic activity (Ebenstein 2003, xii-xiii). Von Mises found Hayek a civil service job, and in 1927 established an institute devoted to business cycle research with Hayek as director (Kresge, Stephen. 1994a, 6-7, 9). Other than for 1923-1924, when Hayek was working in New York City, he lived in Vienna from 1924 until 1931. While living in New York he became skeptical of governmental actions and institutions.⁴⁴

Shift in Career and Geography

In 1931 Hayek was invited to join the London School of Economics (LSE) by director William Beveridge (as previously mentioned a prominent members of the Eugenics Society). Hayek edited a new edition of founder of the Austrian School of Economics, Carl Menger's (1840-1921) writings, and became a devotee of the "spontaneous generation of institutions" theory. In 1938 he became a British citizen (Kresge 1994a, 14, 57).⁴⁵

In 1944 Hayek published his most famous work, *The Road to Serfdom*, where he argues that socialism and central planning can lead to totalitarianism such as found under National Socialism in Germany. Hayek (1944, 243) in the bibliography of this work states, "There are also important German and Italian works of a similar character which, in consideration for their authors, it would be unwise at present to mention by name" as these researchers had lost individual liberty under totalitarian systems.

Melissa Lane (2013, 44) suggests that ideas at the heart of *The Road to Serfdom* grew out of the "economic theory and practice debates of the peacetime 1920s-1930s... Attacks on planning itself had already been formulated in its essential by Hayek by the end of the 1930s." Hayek (1994b, xxi) notes that he began writing *The Road to Serfdom* in 1940 in his "spare time" based upon his 1938 article in *Contemporary Review* ⁴⁶ and finished the work late 1943. This effort unexpectedly became "a starting point of more than thirty years' work in a new field."

Moreover, Hayek (1967, 216) relates that while he was in London he "*kept in close touch with affairs on the Continent* and was able to do so until the outbreak of the war. What I had thus seen of the origins and evolution of the various totalitarian movements made me feel that English public opinion, particularly among my friends who held 'advanced' views on social

matters, completely misconceived the nature of those movements” [Emphasis mine]. He may have been referring to family or friends in Nazi Germany who were familiar with what was really happening in terms of state mandated eugenic sterilizations and euthanasia.

Lane (2013, 56) notes that in *Laws, Legislation and Liberty, Volume I* (1973) Hayek contends that *The Road to Serfdom* had been misunderstood. The book had not sought to assert an automatic link between planning and totalitarian deprivation of liberty. It was rather a warning to mend principles. In this work Hayek (1973,58) states, “What I meant to argue in *The Road to Serfdom* was certainly not that whenever we depart, however slightly, from what I regard as the principles of a free society, we shall ineluctably be driven to go the whole way to a totalitarian system.”

In *The Road to Serfdom*, Hayek (1944, 156) details how a totalitarian system is created.

The totalitarian leader may be guided merely by an instinctive dislike of the state of things he has found and a desire to create a new hierarchical order...he may merely know that he dislikes the Jews who seemed to be so successful in an order which did not provide a satisfactory place for him, and that he loves and admires the tall blond man, the ‘aristocratic’ figure of the novels of his youth. So he will readily embrace theories which seem to provide a rational justification for the prejudices which he shares with many of his fellows. Thus a pseudoscientific theory becomes part of the official creed to which to a greater or lesser degree directs everybody’s action.

Hayek appears to explain how anti-Semitism led to atrocities under the guise of eugenics under Nazi rule. He may also have been thinking of how his brother Erik became involved in proto Nazism as a youth in the *völkisch* movement.

Nordic Superiority, Anti-Semitism and Hayek

Nordic Superiority

Hayek in many ways was a product of his early life and times when Nordic superiority was the prevailing thought in Anglo-Germanic cultures. Evidence of racist opinions, commonly accepted in these cultures from the late nineteenth century through the Post-World War II period, is found in Hayek’s remarks later in life. In the United States racist sentiments did not begin to dissipate until the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and are still found in certain segments of the American culture as illustrated by the 2016 Republican nominee for president, Donald Trump’s, negative comments in speeches about ethnic groups; Trump also had support from white supremacists/neo-Nazi groups.⁴⁷

Hayek demonstrated belief in both Nordic superiority and “hierarchy of the races” views in several instances. Leeson (2015a, 19), based upon archival evidence, states that “when confronted with the prospect of having to deal with African-Americans, Hayek (5 March 1975) informed Neil McLeod at the Liberty Fund that he wished to find an alternative to his ‘gone negro’ Chicago bank.” In addition, Charlotte Cubitt (2006,51), Hayek’s appointed biographer, remarks that “When I asked him whether he felt uncomfortable about Jewish people he replied that he did not like them very much, any more than he liked black people”(Cubitt 2006, 51).

From the 1978 UCLA interview with Robert Chitester, Hayek remarks ‘there were certain types, and conspicuous among them the Near Eastern populations, which I still dislike because they are fundamentally dishonest. And I must say dishonest is a thing I intensely dislike. It was a type which, in my childhood in Austria, was described as Levantine, typical of the eastern Mediterranean’...Indians were, he felt, ‘fundamentally dishonest...a detestable type...I have found a little of the same among the Egyptians – basically a lack of honesty in them.’

Hayek subscribed to aristocratic beliefs. Leeson (2015a, 168) reiterates Hayek’s opinion of the races based upon de Gobineau. “Non-whites were at the bottom of the Austrian neo-feudal hierarchy; at the top were those who illegally added titles (‘von,’ ‘count’ etc.) to their names. The date at which a family became beneficiaries of the Hapsburg intergenerational entitlement programme appears to reflect status...pre-1806 cohort like Hayek...are described as ‘hereditary knight[s] of the holy Roman Empire.’”⁴⁸ From Chitester’s 1978 interviews, Hayek proclaims, “The whole traditional concept of aristocracy of which I have a certain conception – I have moved, to some extent in aristocratic circles and I like their style of life.”

Leeson (2015a, 45) observes that “Over the centuries, white supremacy in many parts of the world has been defended on a variety of grounds: Hayek (1978), for example, defends the ‘civilization’ of apartheid against the American fashion of ‘human rights.’” Hayek argues that certain main concerns can spread [in the United States] with incredible speed. Take the conception of human rights...The United States discovered human rights two years ago or five years ago.”⁴⁹

On the other hand, Hayek (1988, 22) makes reference to “a highly successful book by the well-known social anthropologist,” V. Gordon Child (1936), *Man Makes Himself*. Hayek states it “include[s] the unscientific, even animistic, notion that at some stage the rational human mind or soul entered the evolving human body and became a new, active guide of further cultural development.” Childe, as previously mentioned, had written the popular work concerning superiority of the Germanic languages and Nordics. Could this remark indicate

that Hayek later in life considered the superiority of Aryan race and languages now unscientific?

Based upon these materials, it appears that Hayek accepted the hierarchy of the races theory as proposed by Count de Gobineau. However, when he saw the results of this as official doctrine under National Socialism he may have reconsidered the pernicious of this theory later in life.

Anti-Semitism

Conflicting views exist on whether Hayek held anti-Semitic feelings. Several Jews, or baptized Jews, influenced him or were close personal friends. These included his mentor Ludwig von Mises and Karl Popper (1902-1994) a close friend. Hayek even dedicates *Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Economics* (1967) to Popper. Ebenstein (2001, 8) points out that “the Germanic world in 1899 was thoroughly prejudiced and anti-Semitism was rampant, particularly in Vienna.”

Three upper-middle class social circles existed in Vienna. Hayek (1994a, 59-60) explains, “the Vienna of the 1920s and 1930s is not intelligible without the Jewish problem....there was close contact between the purely Christian group and the mixed group [Jews, baptized Jews and Christians], and again between the mixed group and the Jewish group, but not between the two extremes.”

Hayek (1994a, 61) makes clear, “That his family in Vienna was a part of the ‘purely Christian group’ but in ‘the university context I entered into the mixed group.’” Leeson (2015b, 22) infers that “purely Christian” means “proto-Nazi or anti-Semitic.” In addition, Hayek’s father was the president of a highly nationalistic society of German physician (Leeson 2015b, 22). In 1935 under National Socialism, all non-Aryans and Jews were required to resign from this society and all academic positions (Leeson 2015b, 94-95). Cubitt (2006, 17) remarks that Hayek told her, “National Socialism had begun in Austria and ...had been actively upheld here long before it had reached Germany.” In addition, his “mother had been converted to Nazism by a woman friend” (Cubitt 2006, 17). Leeson (2015b, 23) contends that when Hitler arrived in Vienna in 1907 and perhaps concerned about the possibility that his grandfather had been Jewish “he acquired his virulent anti-Semitism from the climate created by the von Hayek family and others.”

Although he constantly moved in the intellectual mixed group, when asked if he met Freud, Hayek (1994a, 60) remarks “to have met somebody in the purely Jewish group was so unlikely.” Hayek (1994a, 57) notes “almost from the beginning of my university career, I became connected with a group of contemporaries who belonged to the best type of the

Jewish intelligentsia of Vienna.” This mixed group which accepted him was “much more internationally minded than my own circle” (Hayek 1994a, 58).

However, Hayek was obsessed about the possibility of having had Jewish ancestry. Due to his brother, Heinz, being “swarthy” which brought comments from Jewish friends that he “looked Jewish,” Hayek (1994a, 61-62) traced his ancestry “back five generations” and “so as far back as I can possibly trace it, I evidently had no Jewish ancestors whatever.” Cubitt (2006,51) reports that “Hayek was also at pains to point out, and was to repeat this many times, that his family could not have had Jewish roots because their name was spelled with a ‘y’, which was the German-Czech version, and not the ‘j’, which was the Jewish one.” A second cousin of his mother, philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (1899-1951), however, was three-quarters Jewish (Hayek 1994a, 60-61).

When asked in an interview about anti-Semitism at the University of Vienna and why his mentor von Mises was never given a professorship, Hayek (1994a, 59) claims it was likely “because Jews needed to have support from their fellow Jews and the Jews who were teaching were all socialists, and Mises was an anti-socialist, so he could not get the support of his own fellows.” However, Hayek does not explain the views of the non-Jewish professors.

Additionally, Hayek (1944, 139) in *The Road to Serfdom* states, “The enemy, whether he be internal, like the ‘Jew’ or the ‘kulak,’ or external, seems to be an indispensable requisite in the armory of a totalitarian leader...in Germany it was the Jew who became the enemy.” Christian Germans and Austrians perceived that capitalist Jews had excluded them from more highly esteemed occupations. “The fact that German anti-Semitism and anti-capitalism spring from the same root is of great importance for the understanding of what has happened there, but this is rarely grasped by foreign observers” (Hayek 1944:139-140).

Ebenstein (2001, 8) argues that Hayek did not share the anti-Semitic views of many, perhaps most, of his Christian contemporaries.” But, Ebenstein (2001, 293) describes letters to the *London Times* (Feb 11, 1978, 15; March 9, 1978), when concerns about immigrants into Britain were being discussed. Hayek remarks, as quoted by Ebenstein (2001, 293), “when I grew up in Vienna the established Jewish families were a generally respected group and all decent people would frown upon the occasional anti-Jewish outbursts of a few popular politicians. It was the sudden influx of large numbers of [Eastern European Jews during World War I]... which changed the attitude. They were too visibly different to be readily absorbed.” This letter brought scathing comments including that “anti-Semitism in Austria was endemic.” Ebenstein (2001, 294) notes that Hayek responds that it was a problem of acculturation and not race and argues that Hayek “did not perceive meaningful physiological diversity among humanity’s races.”

Hayek, in his autobiographical interview (1994a, 61), remarks that, “The Jewish problem in Vienna became acute only as a result of emigration from Poland. There was an old, established Jewish population in Vienna...who were fully accepted and recognized. The violent anti-Semitism occurred when very primitive, poor Polish Jews, immigrated, already before the war and partly in flight from the Russians during the war. Vienna became filled with a type of Jew which hadn’t been known before, with cap on and long beardsAnd it was against them that anti-Semitism developed.” This is similar to attitudes in the United States of the nativist aspect of the American eugenics movement, as previously discussed, that led to immigration restriction laws.

Based upon Hayek’s archives, Leeson (2015a, 19; 2015b, 23) believes Hayek was anti-Semitic.⁵⁰ Ebenstein (2001, 8) does not. Others have entered this controversial fray. Ronald Hamowdy (2002) rebuffs an article by Melvin Reder (2000), claiming that Hayek was anti-Semitic, based upon the same archive sources. Therefore, conflicting information exists on Hayek’s views on Jews. As a product of his times, Hayek may have disliked “The Jews” in the collective, but not individual Jewish mentors, friends and colleagues.

Influences of Eugenic Colleagues and the Eugenic Movement

In the 1930s and 1940s, Hayek gradually abandoned pure economic interest and “turned toward broader questions in social and political philosophy” (Angner 2007, 2). This is sometimes referred to as “Hayek’s transformation.”⁵¹ Much of Hayek’s later work defended a classical liberal vision of limited government. He contrasted the “spontaneous order” of the market with the “artificial order” promoted by socialists (Angner 2007, 2). Could this transformation have been based upon the eugenics movement with government mandated sterilization and other laws as found in the United States and Germany along with influences from his colleagues and friends who supported eugenics?

Due to the many publications on racial hygiene – or eugenics – the concept of “improving the race and national vitality of a nation” was likely known to Hayek in his teenage and early adult years while in Vienna, the United States, and in Britain. State eugenic sterilizations laws were already in force beginning in the first decade of the twentieth century in the United States. The negative eugenics sterilization programmes in the United States, in Germany under National Socialism, and in other countries could have been a major influence in solidifying his opposition to eugenics as an aspect of central planning.

The Carr-Saunders’ Influence Debate

As mentioned, from 1931 until 1951 Hayek lived in Britain. A number of his colleagues or friends were actively involved with the eugenics movement and were members of the

Eugenics Society. Of all those who embraced eugenics, Erik Angner (2007) argues that Carr-Saunders, in particular, and Oxford zoology, in general, appears to have had a major influence on Hayek's evolutionary thought. I also propose that this influence includes the eugenics movement.

Angner (2007, 83) notes that Carr-Saunders was a close friend and colleague of Hayek at the LSE between 1937 and 1949. The two also had been evacuated to Cambridge during the war and over the years had ample opportunity to discuss, or even read, each other's intellectual views and writings. Angner (2007, 80) points out that in Hayek's works on cultural evolution, numerous references to Carr-Saunders' *The Population Problem* (1922) are found. The core of Carr-Saunders (1922, 223) theory in this work, which Hayek adopted is, "Those groups practicing the most advantageous customs will have an advantage in the constant struggle between adjacent groups" as the mechanism for cultural evolution. This was first cited by Hayek (1967b, 67) in Chapter 4, "Notes on the evolution of systems of rules of conduct," as being the basis of his theory in *Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Economics* (1967b).

In addition Angner (2002, 24) remarks, that "Hayek repeatedly denounced the Social Darwinists... when they concentrated on individual rather than group selection, and on the selection of inherited rather than acquired characteristics. Hayek later suggests in *The Fatal Conceit* (1988, 16), that "The earliest clear statement of such matters known to me was made by A.M. Carr-Saunders... Carr-Saunders, however, stressed the capacity to restrict rather than to increase population" through abortion and infanticide which Hayek was against.

In the post-World War II era eugenics had become an opprobrium. Angner claims that Hayek's autobiographical remarks fail to acknowledge the influence of his longtime friend, Carr-Saunders, on his economic and political theories; instead he emphasized the importance of Carl Menger and the British moral philosophers.

Angner, (2007, 89) suggests that "When Hayek published his 'notes' in 1967...the eugenics movement had been in decline for some time; even before his death in 1966, even Carr-Saunders himself tried to gain distance from it." However, evidence suggests that Carr-Saunders was an active member of the Eugenics society at least ten years after the war as mentioned previously. Angner argues that Carr-Saunders involvement with eugenics may have indicated that Hayek disliked the whole concept of eugenics and he, "may... have wanted to distance himself from Carr-Saunders because of the latter's association with the eugenics movement" (Angner 2007, 89). But, Keynes, Huxley, and Pigou, who were also eugenics supporters, were also cited in this work. It should be noted, however, that only Keynes was mentioned in the first 1944 edition of *Road to Serfdom* and no ES members were

mentioned in the *Counter Revolution of Science* (1952) two immediate post-World War II works when eugenics was synonymous with the Holocaust.

The full detailed quote⁵² and credit to Carr-Saunders (1922, 223) for Hayek's theory of group selection is not spelled out until *Law, Legislation and Liberty* (1973, 148, fn. 15). A partial quote is in *The Fatal Conceit* (1988, 16). Perhaps after time Hayek felt it was safe once again to give Carr-Saunders the full credit he deserved in these later works? However, in Hayek's autobiographical work, *Hayek on Hayek* (1994a), based upon interviews only eugenic supporters and economists Pigou and Keynes were mentioned. So it is unclear if Hayek wanted to distance himself from his eugenic colleagues.

On-the-other-hand, in opposition to Angner's analysis, Bruce Caldwell (2004, 355, fn.16.) does not believe that Carr-Sanders had a major influence on Hayek. Caldwell argues that Hayek started citing Carr-Sanders when he introduced the notion of group selection in the late 1960s. Angner lists five places in which the citation of Carr-Saunders occurs. Three of the five, however, involve Hayek quoting the same passage from *The Population Problem*. Having found a good quote, Caldwell claims, Hayek kept using it. He also argues that Angner does not point out that Hayek references other eugenic supporters along with Carr-Sanders in the same places including Popper and Huxley.

However, due to Hayek's long time association with the British eugenics leader, Carr-Saunders, it appears that Hayek reaction towards negative eugenics as a method of central control was influenced by his colleagues as ideas generally evolve out of some cultural, intellectual or social experiences. Both Carr-Saunders and Popper imply negative eugenics (along with abortion and infanticide) and Hayek was familiar with their writings as discussed next.

Negative Eugenics

Although the term "eugenics" is not used, Carr-Saunders (1922, 223) in *The Population Problem* suggests an aspect of cultural evolution could be infanticide which was later found under National Socialism.

There would grow up an idea that it was the right thing to bring up a certain limited number of children, and the limitation of the family would be enforced by convention...the evidence shows that there is even among the most primitive races at times at least some deliberation as to whether a child shall be allowed to live...the disadvantages of too many mouths may be obvious.

Carr-Saunders (1922, 475) also addresses eugenics philosophy when he states, “Problems of population fall under two main headings, problems of *quantity* and problems of *quality*” [emphasis mine]. This is similar to the eugenicists’ “unfit” (who were having too many children) and the “fit” (who were not having enough). In Hayek’s viewpoint, state control over reproduction would be eugenics although he did not use the term either.

As mentioned previously, negative eugenics generally included segregation, sterilization and laws to prevent marriage of the sick and unfit. Most mainstream eugenicists were against euthanasia, abortion and infanticide. Under the Nazi regime, however, those with mental illness were often sterilized and/or euthanized. Hayek suffered from bouts of severe depression that may have been inherited from his mother who had attempted suicide (See Leeson 2015a, fn 4, p.21; Cubitt 2006, 89).

Leeson (2015a,13), based upon the UCLA interview papers suggests, “Hayek lost about a decade to incapacitating mental illness; at other times, his suicidal depression was replaced by what he called ‘frightfully egotistic’ feelings.” These appear to be signs of a bi-polar affective disorder once called “manic-depressive,” or of severe clinical depression episodes. Perhaps Hayek was against eugenics based upon reports from Nazi Germany that he could have been forced to be sterilized or even euthanatized under this totalitarian system?

Eugenics as Central Planning

Hayek, as has been noted by many biographers – and Hayek himself – was against “central planning” or government run production, institutions, and social control. Ebenstein (2003, xii) suggests that Hayek expanded von Mises’ theory, and feared that collective government control over the economy would lead to totalitarianism while the free market, based on state laws, would keep government intervention to a minimum. Peart and Levy (2005, 25) define progressive “as a belief that human nature can and should be improved” which could be construed as eugenics.

Angner (2007, 100) proposes that the “socialist tendencies that Hayek deplored in the ‘progressive circles’ of the 1920s and 30s may have been the eugenics movement.” He also goes on to say “far from being a serious alternative to nazism, in Hayek’s view, socialism was a precursor to it. Because of its socialist tendencies, he feared that England would repeat the fate of Germany.” Angner (2007,101) also maintains that “Surely, Hayek considered eugenicists’ attempts to improve the racial stock of society an instantiation of the socialist or ‘engineering’ mindset which he denounced.”

Hayek (1952a, 94) in *Counter-Revolution of Science* is opposed to planning and social engineering that appears to encompass eugenics. He claims:

Most of the schemes for a complete remodeling of society, from the earlier utopias to modern socialism, bear indeed the distinct mark of [engineering] influence. In recent years this desire to apply engineering techniques to the solution of social problems has been very explicit: ‘political engineering’ and ‘social engineering’ have become fashionable catchwords which are quite characteristic of the outlook of the present generation as its predilection for ‘conscious’ control.

Peart and Levy (2005, 105) also interpret this passage to include eugenics. They argue:

That eugenics was a program that entailed wide-ranging intervention by the state, intervention purportedly designed to obtain the appropriate “quality” of the population. As such it was, it was a demographic form of central planning. We usually think of central planning as it relates to material things, setting prices and outputs of goods and services. And as we know that this form of planning was vigorously opposed within the economics community, notably by Ludwig von Mises and F.A. Hayek... [W]ere the opponents of material forms of central planning also opposed to planning for the quality of human beings?

Andrew Farrant (2008, 26) remarks that “Hayek never wrote on eugenics to my knowledge, though he did play an instrumental role in the publication of Popper’s *The Open Society*. Hayek (1994a, 51) had read one of Karl Popper’s (the Austrian-British philosophy of science academic) early works (1935) and found that he “agreed with him more than with anybody else on philosophical matters.” Popper, who had Jewish ancestry, had immigrated to New Zealand in 1937 to escape Nazism. Hayek assisted Popper, in getting his work, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, published in England in 1945, a two volume work. In the acknowledgements, Popper ([1945] 2003, xv) states “I am deeply indebted to Professor F. A. von Hayek. Without his interest and support the book would not have been published.”

In Vol. 1, Popper ([1945] 2003, 379) criticizes Plato when he proposes that the “race of the guardians [rulers] must be kept pure” – in other words negative nativist/Nordic superiority eugenics. This included secret infanticide of offspring of the inferior and those born defective. This type of “social engineering” through central governmental control, in turn, Popper argues would lead to a totalitarian society, which, of course, was the type of government control found under the Nazi regime.

The year before Poppers tome, Hayek had attacked eugenics under the guise of Nazi social engineering. Hayek (1944, 146-147) was against the concept of the ends justify the means to and maintains:

But where a few specific ends dominate the whole of society, it is inevitable that occasionally cruelty may become a duty ... such as the killing of the old or sick, should be treated as mere matters of expediency; that the compulsory uprooting and transportation of hundreds of thousand should become an instrument of policy approved by almost everybody except the victims or that suggestions like that of a ‘conscription of women for breeding purposes’⁵³ can be seriously contemplated.” (Hayek 1944, 150)

This passage also suggests that Hayek was familiar with details of the Nazi eugenics sterilizations, euthanasia, and *Lebensborn* programmes.

As mentioned, Ludwig von Mises’, *Socialism (Die Gemeinwirtschaft)*, originally published in 1922, greatly influenced Hayek and others of his generation. Later in life, Hayek wrote the Foreword for the 1981 English edition of the work.⁵⁴ Hayek notes that the Epilogue for the new edition was written twenty-five years (1947) after the original volume and after World War II.⁵⁵ Von Mises in his Epilogue was vehemently against National Socialism and attacks eugenics as the end result of central control under a socialistic system. He ([1936]1969, 581) states:

The Nazi plan was more comprehensive and therefore more pernicious than that of the Marxians. It aimed at abolishing *laissez-faire* not only in the production of material goods, *but no less in the production of men* [emphasis mine]. The Führer was not only the general manager of all industries; he was also the general manager of the breeding-farm intent upon rearing superior men and eliminating inferior stock. A grandiose scheme of eugenics was to put into effect according to “scientific” principles.

It is vain for champions of eugenics to protest that they did not mean what the Nazis executed. Eugenics aims at placing some men, backed by the police power, in complete control of human reproduction. It suggests that the methods applied to domestic animals be applied to men. This is precisely what the Nazis tried to do. The only objection which a consistent eugenist can raise is that his own plan differs from that of the Nazi scholars and that he wants to rear another type of men than the Nazis. As every supporter of economic planning aims at the execution of his own plan only, so every advocate of eugenic planning aims at the execution of his own plan and wants himself to act as the breeder of human stock.⁵⁶

Angner (2007, 100) argues that Hayek may have deplored the eugenics movement as he mentions in *The Road to Serfdom, Fiftieth Anniversary Edition* (1994b, xxi), that his change in direction from “‘pure economic theory’. ... was caused by my annoyance with the complete misinterpretation in English ‘progressive circles’ of the character of the Nazi movement.”

Hayek also states that the “book contains...a warning that unless we mend the principles of our policy, some very unpleasant consequences will follow which most of those who advocate these policies do not want” (1994b, xxiv).⁵⁷ Those policies were likely race hygiene under National Socialism as England never passed a eugenic sterilization law.

In this work Hayek (1994b, 6) also remarks:

Few are ready to recognize that the rise of fascism and nazism was not a reaction against socialist trends of the proceeding period but a necessary outcome of those tendencies....as a result, many who think themselves infinitely superior to the aberrations of naziism, and sincerely hate all of its manifestations, work at the same time of ideals whose realization would lead straight to the abhorred tyranny.

Based upon the influences of Hayek’s family and colleagues, the eugenics movement, in particular as it developed under National Socialism in Germany, may have solidified Hayek’s arguments against central planning within socialism. These state controlled institutions, in turn, he believed could lead to a totalitarian society where individual rights are obliterated.

Summary

Hayek from childhood was familiar with the concepts of Darwinism, Nordic superiority and the anti-Semitic sentiments of the times. He would have been familiar with the German, American and British eugenics movement and became skeptical of government actions and intent which shaped his thought. Kresge, in his introduction to *Hayek on Hayek*, argues that “Hayek’s achievement was to demonstrate that economic theory, like any theory of social behavior, is a theory of evolution” (1994a, 31). When he first wrote on Nazi socialism in the mid-1930s, Hayek viewed the eugenic sterilization and euthanasia programs as the evils that could result from socialism and feared that Britain could be going in the same direction. He likely championed this opinion by assisting Karl Popper in publishing his anti-eugenic central planning tome.

Eugenic publications and colleagues, who were eugenic adherents from the 1920s through the late 1940s (in particular Alexander Carr-Saunders), helped influence Hayek’s theory of the natural selection of groups, and of central planning in a socialistic system. This governmental social engineering, in turn, could potentially lead to a totalitarian society and lack of individual freedom through eugenic mandates as found under Nazism.

On the other hand, his childhood upbringing, family, and Viennese cultural influences, leads to conflicting information concerning his anti-Semitic and racial opinions which were part of the nativist/Nordic superiority branch of the eugenics movement for improving health and

national vitality of the nation; and in Nazi Germany leading to the “final solution.” Curiously he was concerned if he had Jewish ancestors. By modern standards comments made by Hayek would be considered racist. However, during the first half of the twentieth century, the belief in the superiority of the northern European – and in particular the Nordic – “race,” was accepted as a matter of course by most Anglo-Germanic professionals and the educated middle and upper-middle classes.

Although Hayek likely thought other ethnic and racial groups were inferior, he did not apparently suggest they be prevented from breeding as found in negative eugenics governmental sterilization programmes, particularly in the United States and under National Socialism. Nor did he appear to suggest that mentally ill or disabled people be so treated or eliminated. This may have been due to his own, and other family members, severe depressive episodes.

It is concluded, based on the information available, that Hayek was not directly involved in any aspect of the eugenics movement nor did he write on the subject in any eugenic journals or other publications. Hayek was against eugenics practices as illustrated by his opposition to state controlled central planning and social engineering programmes which included eugenics. Eugenacist colleagues, family, friends and his environment appear to have had some influence on the development of his theories.

Notes

¹ Eugenics was practiced in many countries, and not just in Europe and the Americas. Japan, like Nazi Germany, had an emphasis on “racial purity.” The focus of this chapter will be on American, British and German eugenics as Friedrich Hayek likely was familiar with the literature and had colleagues from these cultures. See Robertson (2002); Turda and Gillette (2014); Turda (2010); Turda and Weindling (2007) and also Whitney (1934, 139).

² A clean living movement is a period of time when a surge of health reform crusades, many with moral overtones erupts into the popular consciousness (Engs (1991, 1), Engs (2000), Engs (2003, ix-x).

³ See also Donald Pickens (1968) for a detailed account of the eugenics movement during the Progressive era in the United States.

⁴ These and other terms that might be offensive in today’s culture were considered proper scientific nomenclature in the first half of the twentieth century.

⁵ The term “race” had many meanings in the early twentieth century it could mean “her race” – woman as opposed to man; the classical Caucasian, Oriental, or Negroid races; the five races of Europe, or even the Irish race. See Huxley and Hadden (1936, 215-216).

⁶ Other terms for eugenics since the mid-nineteenth century have included inherited realities, race betterment, race improvement, race culture, race regeneration, sanitary marriage, racial hygiene (*rassenhygiene*), and stirpiculture.

⁷ See also Saleeby (1914, 19-20, 31).

⁸ The contests encouraged mothers to improve the health of their children so their babies would be prizewinners at local and state agricultural fairs. See Dorey (1999); Holt (1995).

⁹ Saleeby (1914, 18, 31, 112) also coined the term racial poisons. See also Searle (1976).

¹⁰ Also see Saleeby (1911, 256-259).

¹¹ See Dowbiggin (2003), Harris (2010), Turda (2010), Turda and Gillette (2014), and Turda and Weindling (2007) for more information on other international eugenics programmes and public policies.

¹² See Darwin (1859), Jordanova (1984) and Degler (1991) for further information.

¹³ See Corsi (1988), Jordanova (1984), Saleeby (1909, 205-253) for more information.

¹⁴ See Edelson (1999) and Henig (2000) for more information on Mendel and his theory.

¹⁵ See Banister (1988), Degler (1991), Hawkins (1997) and Hofstadter (1959) for additional material concerning Social Darwinism..

¹⁶ See Engs (2005, 120-122), Haller (1963, 163-167), Ludmerer (1972a, 77-80).

¹⁷ For a sample of publications that support inheritance of intelligence between social economic classes and/or race see Jenson (1969), Herrnstein and Murray (1994), Lynn (2001), Lynn and Vanhanen (2002). For examples that refute the inheritance of intelligence due to race and/or class See Alland (2004), Jacoby and Glauberman (1995), Kerr and Shakespeare (2002) and Kincheloe, et. al. (1997). See also Gould, 1981 who traces the history of intelligence measurements and Chomsky (1978) and his other works concerning language, intelligence and race.

¹⁸ Also translated *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1856).

¹⁹ For further information on race see Barkan (1992), Coon (1971) and Marks (1995).

²⁰ See also Engs (2005, 5-7); Engs (2014); Haller 1984; Ludmerer (1972a,34-35); Pickens 1968.

²¹ An early study before Davenport was Richard Dugdale's, *The Jukes* (1877). Davenport's research influenced other family studies including the *Kallikats* (1912), the *Nams* (1912) and *The Jukes in 1915* (1916). *The Mongrel Virginians* (1926) was the only study of a mixed race group. Several states also conducted a series of reports including *Mental Defectives in Indiana* (1916-1922) and the *Eugenics Survey of Vermont* (1924-1936). See also Rafter (1988); Paul (1995); Gallagher (1999) for further information concerning family history studies

²² Charles Davenport, Alexander Graham Bell, Harvard University president Charles Eliot, David Starr Jordan and conservationist Gifford Pinchot were vice presidents. Henry Fairfield Osborn, Madison Grant and several biologists were delegates. See *Problems in Eugenics, Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress*, University of London July 24th to 30th, 1912. <https://archive.org/details/b28105874>. Accessed 3 August, 2016.

²³ Founders and early members included leading nativist, and non-nativist, eugenicists: Irving Fisher (was its first chair), Madison Grant, Harry H. Laughlin, Henry Fairfield Osborn, Roswell H. Johnson, Ellsworth Huntington, Charles Davenport, Henry Perkins and other prominent academics and philanthropists were members (Mehler 1988, 81).

²⁴ See Lombardo 2008 for more information about this famous case.

²⁵ See also Carlson (2001), Reilly (1991), and Whitney (1934, 135-138).

²⁶ See Grant (1916, 80-82), Stoddard (1920, 261-262) and see also Ludmerer (1972a, 24-26).

²⁷ See Grant 1916, insert between pp.122-123.

²⁸ See Carson (2001), Engs (2005 123-125), Glad (2011, 6), Kraut (1994), Markel (1997).

²⁹ See Engs (2014), Hall (1906, 84-85), Kraut (1994, 50-77), Ludmerer (1972a,b), Martin 2011,139) and Reimers (1998, 10-19) for more details about immigration restriction legislation which was intertwined with public health, nativist and eugenic concerns.

³⁰ See Hall (1906, 86), Martin (2011, 132-151), Haller ([1963]1984, 155-156), Mehler (1988, 2), Ludmerer (1972b, 61-65). Also see <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act>. Accessed 4 July 2016. For further detail about the immigration restriction movement and its interlinking with eugenics see Engs (2014), Ludmerer (1972b).

³¹ See Farrall (1985), Saleeby (1909, 1914), Searle (1976), Soloway (1990) for further information concerning the British eugenics movement.

³² See <https://www.scribd.com/doc/97123506/Eugenics-Society-Members-A-Z-2012> for members list. Accessed 24 July 2016.

³³ Economist J. M. Keynes was a director (1937–1944) and V.P. 1937 of the society; A. M. Carr-Saunders was President (1949-1953) and Julian Huxley, (V.P. 1937-1944, Pres. 1959-1962). See annual membership lists from *Eugenics Review* published by the Eugenics Society (1930-1950).

³⁴ Galton lectures were also given by Carr-Saunders (1935), Huxley (1936), Keynes (1937) and Beveridge (1943). See Galton Lecturers list (1968).

³⁵ Eugenics Society 1930-1950; Kühl, S. to R. Engs (15 June 2016). List of people attending European eugenics or population conferences. Private communication via email.

³⁶ See Kühl (1994; 2013), Turda and Weindling (2007), Weindling (2007;1989), Weingart (1989) Weiss (1986; 1987a,b) for more information pertaining to the German eugenics movement.

³⁷ Per convention *Rassenhygiene* and eugenics will be used interchangeably.

³⁸ See also Kühl (2013), Weindling (1989), and Weingart (1989).

³⁹ See also Weiss (1987b, 227-228).

⁴⁰ This program to breed a master race ran from December 1935 to about 1945. See Clay and Leapman (1995) and Henry and Hiller (1976).

⁴¹ See also Haller (1984, xi).

⁴² Detailed biographical information can be found in biographies by Cubitt (2006), Ebenstein (2001; 2003) in addition to *Hayek on Hayek* (1994a) a work based upon interviews with Hayek later in his life.

⁴³ See Leeson (2015b, 22-23, 94) and Leeson 2015c, 66-69) for further details concerning Hayek's family pedigree and Nazi leanings.

⁴⁴ Kresge (1994a, 7) explains that in New York, reading accounts of the Great War, he realized that "the truth about the course of the war had been largely kept from the Austrian people. We can date Hayek's skepticism toward the actions and motives of governments from this point."

⁴⁵ Later after the war, Hayek moved to the United States (1951-1961) and was at the University of Chicago Committee on Social Thought. He then went to Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany as a professor and had several visiting professorships. In 1974 he was awarded the Nobel Prize in economic science and ended his career in Freiburg where he died. See works by Cubitt (2006), Ebenstein (2001, 2003), Leeson 2013; 2015a,b,c, and Hayek's (1994a) interview autobiography.

⁴⁶ von Hayek, F A. Freedom and the Economic System. *The Contemporary Review*. 1938. January 153:434-442.

⁴⁷ See: O'Connor, Lydia and Daniel Marans. Here Are 10 Examples of Donald Trump being Racist. *The Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/donald-trump-racist-examples_us_56d47177e4b03260bf777e83. Accessed 4 July 2016;
D'Antonio, Michael. Is Donald Trump Racist? Here's What the Record Shows. 7 June 2016. *Fortune*. <http://fortune.com/2016/06/07/donald-trump-racism-quotes/> Accessed 7 August 2016.
Jessica Schulberg argues Trump's Neo-Nazi and Jewish backers are both convinced he's secretly on their side which works out great for him. *The Huffington Post*. 27 May 2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/trump-neo-nazis-jews_us_5747397be4b0dac7ad4480e. Accessed 22 July 2016.

⁴⁸ Leeson 2015a, 168. fn.57. See essay by von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, Erik. Hebrews and Christians. *The Rothbard-Rockwell Report* Archives. April 1998, 6-12.
<http://www.unz.org/pub/rothbardrockwellreport-1998apr-00006> , Accessed 19 October, 2016; Also Childe (1926), Grant (1916), Günther (1927), Stoddard (1920).

⁴⁹ Chitchester 1978; Cited in Leeson 2015a. fn. 25, p. 65; See also Leeson 2015b, 15-16.

⁵⁰ See Leeson 2015a, 19, fn. 37, p.23.

⁵¹ See Caldwell (2004, 2) for details concerning this intellectual change in direction.

⁵² The complete quote by Carr-Saunders in *The Population Problem* (1922,223):

Now men and groups are naturally selected on account of the customs they practice just as they are selected on account of their mental and physical characters. Those groups practicing the most advantageous customs will have an advantage in the constant struggle between adjacent groups over those that practice less advantageous customs. Few customs can be more advantageous than those which limit the numbers of a group to the desirable number, and there is no difficulty in understanding how—once any of these three customs [abortion, infanticide, abstention from intercourse] had originated it would, by as process of natural selection come to be so practiced that it would produce an approximation to the desirable number. .

⁵³ See Clay and Leapman (1995) and Henry and Hillel (1976) concerning the *Lebensborn* program.

⁵⁴ A few more paragraphs were added to the 1932 and 1936 editions. See von Mises, Preface 1981 (xvi; xxiv).

⁵⁵ The epilogue was originally published as *Planned Chaos*. 1947, 1970. Irvington-on-Hudson, NY: Foundation for Economic Education.

⁵⁶ See von Mises ([1936]1969, 578-582) Epilogue Section 8, “Nazism,” for more information on totalitarianism and eugenics as an aspect of this political economic system.

⁵⁷ See also Hayek 1967, 216-217.

Bibliography¹

- Alland, Alexander. 2004. *Race in Mind: Race, IQ, and Other Racisms*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Allen, Garland. E. 2011. Eugenics and Modern Biology: Critiques of Eugenics, 1910–1945. *Annals of Human Genetics*. 75:314-325. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-1809.2011.00649.x
- Angner, Erik. 2002. The History of Hayek's Theory of Cultural Evolution. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*. December 33 (4): 695–718.
<http://mason.gmu.edu/~eangner/pdf/hayekcarrsaunders.pdf>. Accessed June 10, 2016
- Angner, Erik. 2007. *Hayek and Natural Law*. New York: Routledge.
- Bannister, Robert. 1989. *Social Darwinism: Science and Myth in Anglo-American Social Thought*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press [1979]1988.
- Barkan, Elazar. 1992. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Caldwell, Bruce. 2004. *Hayek's Challenge: an Intellectual Biography of F.A. Hayek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carlson, Elof Axel. 2001. *The Unfit: A History of a Bad Idea*. Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.
- Carr-Saunders, A.M. 1926. *Eugenics*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Carr-Saunders, A. M. 1922. *The Population Problem: A Study in Human Evolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Childe, V. Gordon. 1926. *The Aryans: a Study of Indo-European Origins*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Chitester, Robert. 1978. *Friedrich Hayek, interviewed by Robert Chitester*. Center for Oral History Research, University of California, Los Angeles, <http://oralhistory.library.ucla.edu/> Accessed 19 October 2016.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1978. Language Development, Human Intelligence, and Social Organization. in Walter Feinberg, *National Institute of Education (U.S.)*. Educational Equity Group University of Illinois Press, 163-188.
- Coon, Carleton S. 1971. *The Origin of Races*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Clay, Catrine and Michael Leapman. 1995. *Master Race: the Lebensborn Experiment in Nazi Germany*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Corsi, Pietro. 1988. *The Age of Lamarck: Evolutionary Theories in France, 1790-1830*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Translator Jonathon Mandelbaum.
- Crowe, David M. 2008. *The Holocaust: Roots, History, and Aftermath*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cubitt, Charlotte E. 2006. *A Life of Friedrich August Von Hayek*. Bedfordshire, UK: Authors Online Ltd.
- Darwin, Charles. 1859 [1869, 5th ed.] *On the Origin of the Species by Natural Selection*. London: John Murray. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008593625>.
- Darwin, Leonard. 1916a. On the Statistical Studies Needed after the War in Connection With Eugenics. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. March 79(2):159-188. <http://www.jstor.org.proxyiub.uits.iu.edu/stable/2340813> Accessed 3 August 2016.
- Davenport, Charles B. 1929. Do Races Differ in Mental Capacity? *Human Biology*. January 1(1):70-89. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41446972>. Accessed: 11 July 2016.
- Davenport, Charles B. 1911. *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*. New York: H. Holt and Co.
- Degler, Carl. 1991. *In Search of Human Nature: the Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dorey, Annette K. Vance. 1999. *Better Baby Contests: The Scientific Quest for Perfect Childhood Health in the Early Twentieth Century*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland
- Dowbiggin, Ian Robert. 2003. *Keeping America Sane: Psychiatry and Eugenics in the United States and Canada 1880-1940*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ebenstein, Alan O. 2003. *Hayek's Journey: the Mind of Friedrich Hayek*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ebenstein, Alan O. 2001. *Friedrich Hayek: a Biography*. New York: Palgrave for St. Martin's Press.

- Edelson, Edward. 1999. *Gregor Mendel: and the Roots of Genetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Engs, Ruth Clifford. 2014. Eugenics, Immigration Restrictions and the Birth Control Movements (Chapt. 16). In Kathrine A.S. Sibley, Ed. *A Companion to Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover*. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 313-337.
- Engs, Ruth Clifford. 2005. *The Eugenics Movement: An Encyclopedia*. Greenwood Publishing Group: Westport, CT.
- Engs, Ruth Clifford. 2003. *The Progressive Era's Health Reform Movement: A Historical Dictionary*. Praeger Press: Westfield, CT.
- Engs, Ruth Clifford. 2000; 2001. *Clean Living Movement: American Cycles of Health Reform*. Praeger Press: Westfield, CT.
- Engs, Ruth C. 1991. Resurgence of a New Clean Living Movement, *Journal of School Health*, April 61(4):155-189.
- Ericsson, Kjersti and Eva Simonsen, eds. 2005. *Children of World War II: the Hidden Enemy Legacy*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Eugenics Society. 1930-1950. List of fellows and members of the Eugenics Society. *Eugenics Review*. Both paper journal and online. For example 1934. Wellcome Library. <http://library.wellcome.ac.uk/player/b16231508>. Accessed June 12, 2016.
- Farrall, Lyndsay Andrew. [1970]1985. *The Origins and Growth of the English Eugenics Movement, 1865-1925*. New York: Garland Pub.
- Farrant, Andrew. 2008. The “Vanity of the Philosopher” Analytical Egalitarianism, Associatoinist Psychology, and Eugenic Remaking? In Lawrence Moss, Ed. *Social Inequality, Analytical Egalitarianism and the March towards Eugenic Explanations in the Social Sciences*. Chinchester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell .
- Fisher, Irving. 1921. Impending problem of eugenics. *The Scientific Monthly*. 13(3):214-131.
- Fisher, Irving. 1910. *National Vitality: its Wastes and Conservation; Extract from Report of the National Conservation Commission*. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Fisher, Irving. [1909]1976. *National Vitality, its Wastes and Conservation*. New York: Arno.

- Gallagher, Nancy L. 1999. *Breeding Better Vermonters: The Eugenics Project in the Green Mountain State*. Hanover, NY: University Press of New England.
- Galton, Francis. 1909. *Essays in Eugenics*. London: The Eugenics Society.
- Galton, Francis, 1904. Eugenics: its definition, scope, and aims. *The American Journal of Sociology*. July 10(1):1-25. <http://galton.org/essays/1900-1911/galton-1904-am-journ-soc-eugenics-scope-aims.htm>. Accessed: June 28, 2016.
- Galton, Francis. 1883. *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*. New York: Macmillan & Co. www.hathitrust.org. Accessed 10 July 2016.
- Galton, Francis. 1869. *Hereditary Genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London: Macmillan and Co. www.hathitrust.org. Accessed 10 July 2016.
- Glad, John. 2011. *Jewish Eugenics*. Washington: Wooden Shore, LLC.
- Gobineau, Joseph de. H. H. ed. 1856. *Moral and Intellectual Diversity of Races...From the French*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=cx9mAAAAMAAJ>. Accessed 2 August 2016.
- Gosney, E.S. and Paul Popenoe. 1929. *Sterilization for Human Betterment; a Summary of Results of 6,000 Operations in California, 1909-1929*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Grant, Madison. 1916. *The Passing of the Great Race; or, The Racial Basis of European History*. New York: C. Scribner.
- Gould, Stephen Jay. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton.
- Günther, Hans. 1927. *The Racial Elements of European History*. [*Rassenkunde Europas*. 1925] London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. Translator G. C. Wheeler.
- Guyer, Michael. 1916. *Being Well-born: An Introduction to Eugenics*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Hall, Prescott F. 1906. *Immigration and its Effects upon the United States*. NY: Henry Holt and Co.

- Haller, Mark H. [1963] 1984. *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought*. Rutgers: Rutgers University Press.
- Hamowy, Ronald. 2002. A Note on Hayek and Anti-Semitism. *History of Political Economy* 34(1): 255-260.
- Harris, Jane. 2010. *Eugenics and the Firewall: Canada's Nasty Little Secret*. Winnipeg: J.G. Shillingford Pub.
- Hawkin, Mike. 1997. *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought 1860–1945, Nature as Model and Nature as Threat*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1944. *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge.
- Hayek, F. A. 1952a. *The Counter-Revolution of Science: Studies on the Abuse of Reason*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1967b. *Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1973. *Law Legislation and Liberty, Vol. I*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hayek, F. A. 1976. *Law Legislation and Liberty, Vol. II*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hayek, F. A. 1979. *Law Legislation and Liberty, Vol. III*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hayek, F. A. 1988. *The Fatal Conceit: The Errors of Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1994a. Stephen Kresge and Leif Wenar, eds. In *Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hayek, F. A. 1994b. *The Road to Serfdom: Fiftieth Anniversary Edition*. London: Routledge.
- Henig, Robin Marantz. 2000. *The Monk in the Garden: The Lost and Found Genius of Gregor Mendel, the Father of Genetics*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Henry, Clarissa and Marc Hillel. 1976. *Children of the SS*. London: Hutchinson. Translator Erik Mosbacher.

- Herrnstein, Richard J. and Charles Murray. 1996. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Higham, John. 1955. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hildebrandt, Sabine. 2013. Wolfgang Bargmann (1906–1978) and Heinrich von Hayek (1900–1969): Careers in anatomy continuing through German National Socialism to postwar leadership. *Annals of Anatomy*. July 195(4):283–295.
- Hofstadter, Richard. 1986. *The Progressive Movement: 1900 - 1915*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Holt, Marilyn Irvin. 1995. *Linoleum, Better Babies, and the Modern Farm Woman, 1890-1930*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska press.
- Huxley, Julian S. and Alford C. Haddon, with a contribution by A. M. Carr-Saunders. 1936. *We Europeans; a Survey of 'Racial' Problems*. New York: Harper.
- Jensen, Arthur R. 1969. How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*. April 39 (1):1-123.
- Jacoby, Russell and Naomi Glauberman. 1995. *The Bell Curve Debate: History, Documents, Opinions*. New York: Times Books.
- Jordan, David Star. 1902. *Blood of the Nation: A study of the Decay of Races through the Survival of the Unfit*. Boston MA: American Unitarian Association.
- Jordanova, L. J. 1984. *Lamarck*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kallis, Aristotle A. 2007. Racial politics and biomedical totalitarianism in interwar Europe. In Marius Turda and Paul Weindling. 2007. *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Kerr, Anne and Tom Shakespeare. 2002. *Genetic Politics: From Eugenics to Genome*. Cheltenham, England: New Clarion Press.

- Kincheloe, Joe L., ed., Steinberg, Shirley R., ed.; Gresson, Aaron D., III, ed. 1997. *Measured Lies: The Bell Curve Examined*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kraut, Alan N. 1994. *Silent Travelers: Germs, Genes, and the "Immigrant Menace."* New York: Basic Books.
- Kresge, Stephen. 1994a. Introduction, In Stephen Kresge and Leif Wenar, Eds. F.A. Hayek. *Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kühl, Stefan. 2013. *For the Betterment of the Race: The Rise and Fall of the International Movement for Eugenics and Racial Hygiene*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Translator Lawrence Schofer.
- Kühl, Stefan. 1994. *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lane, Melissa. 2013. The genesis and reception of the *Road to Serfdom*. In Robert Leeson, ed. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography. Part I Influences, from Mises to Bartley*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Laughlin, Harry H. 1922. *Eugenical sterilization in the United States: A Report of the Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago*. Chicago: Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago.
- Leeson, Robert, ed. 2013. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography: Part I, Influences from Mises to Bartley*. Basingstoke, Hampshire, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, Robert, ed. 2015a. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography: Part III, Fraud, Fascism and Free Market Religion*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, Robert, ed. 2015b. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography: Part IV, England, the Ordinal Revolution and the Road to Serfdom, 1931-50*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leeson, Robert, ed. 2015c. *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography. Part V, Hayek's Great Society of Free Men*
- Leonard, Thomas. 2003. Progressive Era Eugenics and Economics. *History of Political Economy*. 35 (4): 687-712.

- Lombardo, Paul A. 2008. *Three Generations, No Imbeciles: Eugenics, the Supreme Court, and Buck V. Bell*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ludmerer, Kenneth M. 1972a. *Genetics and American Society: A Historical Appraisal*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ludmerer, Kenneth M. 1972b. Genetics, Eugenics, and the Immigration Restriction Act of 1924. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*. 46:59-81.
- Lynn, Richard, 2006. *Race differences in intelligence: an evolutionary analysis*. Augusta, GA: Washington Summit Publishers.
- Lynn, Richard and Tatu Vanhanen. 2002. *IQ and the Wealth of Nations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Marks, Jonathan. 1993. Historiography of Eugenics. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 52: 650-652.
- Marks, Jonathan. 1995. *Human Biodiversity: Genes, Race, and History*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Markel, Howard. 1997. *Quarantine! East European Jewish immigrants and the New York City Epidemics of 1892*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Martin, Susan F. 2011. *A Nation of Immigrants*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mehler, Barry Alan. 1988. *A History of the American Eugenics Society, 1921-1940*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois. <http://www.ferris.edu/isar/dissertation.htm>. Accessed 11 July 2016.
- Osborn, Henry Fairfield. 1924. The approach to the immigration problem through science. An address delivered at the National Immigration Conference, New York City, December 13 and 14, 1923. Reprinted from *Proceedings of the National Immigration Conference*. New York: Report no. 26 of the National Industrial Conference Board.
- Paul, Diane B. 1995. *Controlling Human Heredity; 1865 to the Present*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- Pearson, Karl and Margaret Moul. 1925. The Problem of Alien Immigration into Great Britain, Illustrated by an Examination of Russian and Polish Jewish children. *Annals of Eugenics* 1:5-55, 56-127.

- Peart, Sandra and David M. Levy. 2005. *The "Vanity of the Philosopher": From Equality to Hierarchy in Postclassical Economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Pickens, Donald K. 1968. *Eugenics and the Progressives*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Popenoe, Paul. 1926. *The Conservation of the Family*. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Co.
- Popenoe, Paul and Roswell Hill Johnson. 1918. *Applied Eugenics*. New York: The Macmillan Co.
- Popper, Karl. [1945] 2003. *The Open Society and Its Enemies: Volume One: The Spell of Plato*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rafter, Nicole Hahn. 1988. *White Trash: The Eugenic Family Studies, 1877-1919*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Reder, Melvin W. 2000. The Anti-Semitism of Some Eminent Economists. *History of Political Economy*. 32(4):833-856.
- Reimers, David M. 1998. *Unwelcome Strangers: American Identity and the Turn against Immigration*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Robertson, Jennifer. 2002. Blood talks: eugenic modernity and the creation of new Japanese. *History and Anthropology* 13(3):191-216.
- Robinson, William J. 1922. *Eugenics, Marriage and Birth Control [Practical Eugenics]*. NY: The Critic and Guide Co.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. 1905. On American motherhood: A speech given in Washington, March 13, 1905, before the National Congress of Mothers.
<http://www.nationalcenter.org/TRooseveltMotherhood.html>. Accessed: 24 June 2016.
- Ross, Edward A. 1901. The Causes of Race Superiority. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 18:67-89. DOI: 10.1177/000271620101800104

- Rubin, Paul H. and Evelyn Gick. 2004. Hayek and Modern Evolutionary Theory. *Evolutionary Psychology and Economic Theory Advances in Austrian Economics*. 7:79–100.
<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~egick/rg.pdf>. Accessed 15 June 2016.
- Saleeby, Caleb Williams. 1909. *Parenthood and Race Culture; an Outline of Eugenics*, NY: Moffat.
- Saleeby, Caleb Williams. 1914. *The Progress of Eugenics*. NY, London: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Searle, G. R. 1976. *Eugenics and Politics in Britain, 1900-1914*. Leyden : Noordhoff International Publishing.
- Spencer, Herbert. 1864. *The Principles of Biology, Volume 1*. London: William and Norgate.
<https://books.google.com/books?id=SRkRAAAAYAAJ> Accessed 10 July 2016.
- Spiro, Jonathan Peter. 2009. *Defending the Master Race: Conservation, Eugenics, and the Legacy of Madison Grant*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press.
- Stern, Alexandra Minna. 2005. *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stoddard, Lothrop. 1920. *Rising Tide of Color against White World Supremacy*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. [.](#)
- Turda, Marius. 2010. *Modernism and Eugenics*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Turda, Marius and Aaron Gillette. 2014. *Latin Eugenics in Comparative Perspective*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Turda, Marius and Paul Weindling. 2007. *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Von Mises, Ludwig. 1981. *Socialism: an Economic and Sociological Analysis*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics. Translator J. Kahane.
- Von Mises, Ludwig. [1936] 1969. *Socialism: an Economic and Sociological Analysis*. London: J. Cape. Translator J. Kahane.

- Weindling, Paul. 2007. In Marius Turda and Paul Weindling. 2007. *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900-1940*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Weindling Paul. 1989. *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism 1870-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weingart, Peter. 1989. German Eugenics between Science and Politics. *Osiris*. 5: 260-282.
- Weiss, Sheila Faith. 1987a. *Race Hygiene and National Efficiency: The Eugenics of Wilhelm Schallmayer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weiss, Sheila Faith. 1987b. The Race Hygiene Movement in Germany. *Osiris* 3:193-236.
- Weiss, Sheila Faith. 1986. Wilhelm Schallmayer and the Logic of German Eugenics. *Isis* 77 (286):33-46.
- Whitney, Leon. 1934. *The Case for Sterilization*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co.
- Wiggam, Albert. 1924. *The Fruit of the Family Tree*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

¹ Although I primarily used the original published paper copies, many items published prior to 1923 can be found in *Hathitrust.org*